REMARKS

Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 17 and 19 to 23 are amended. Claims 5 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice. Support for the amendments can be found for example in the specification at least on page 8 lines 14 to 18 and claims 1 to 23 as originally presented. Applicant has not amended the claims in view of the Examiner's art rejections, which are respectfully traversed for the reasons stated below. Rather, Applicant has amended the claims in order to better define the nature of protection sought. Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 17 and 19 to 23 are pending in the application.

In the Office Action dated February 2, 2009, claims 6, 10-12, 16, 19, 22 and 23 were objected to, while claims 1-4, 7-9, 13-15, 17 and 20-21 were rejected.

The Examiner objected to claims 6, 10-12, 16, 19, 22 and 23 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper form as these multiply-dependent claims depend from an earlier multiply-dependent claim. Applicant has amended claims 6, 10-12, 16, 19, 22 and 23 to remove the objectionable dependencies and requests reconsideration of claims 6, 10-12, 16, 19, 22 and 23 based on their merits.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7-9, 13-15, 17 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No 2002/0141384 to *Liu et al* (hereinafter *Liu*) in view of US Patent No.7,292,855 to *Kumar et al* et al (hereinafter *Kumar*). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1-8 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is untenable and cannot be maintained at least for the reasons stated below.

Claims 5 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Liu* in view of *Kumar* and further in view of US Publication No 2005/0018659 to *Gallant et al.* In order to better define the nature of the invention applicant has cancelled claims 5 and 18 from the instant application. Consequently the objection to these claims is rendered moot.

US Publication No 2002/0141384 to Liu et al

Liu discusses a method of **establishing an audio communication link** (*Liu*, abstract, emphasis added) utilizing media datagrams between a first telephony client located behind a network address translation server and a remote second telephony client. Under the system of *Liu* a call is initiated by a first Internet client to a second Internet client, the first Internet client signals the second Internet client referred to in Liu as a media setup message exchange. After media session set up messages are exchanged, each of the Internet clients exchange compressed voice data utilizing real time protocol (RTP), wherein media datagrams sent over UDP/IP logical channels to provide for a full duplex internet telephony conversation.

In operation, the first Internet client receives a 10-digit telephone number from an operator which identifies the second Internet client. *Liu* makes use of the fact that 10-digit telephone numbers once assigned to a particular device remain relatively stable, unlike the 12-digit IP address used by each Internet client which can change each time the device logs onto an ISP network. Once the first Internet client receives the 10-digit telephone number it opens a TCP/IP connection with the directory server. The directory server facilitates locating a desired client on the Internet for establishing Internet telephony communications between the first Internet client and second Internet client. More

specifically, the directory server includes a mapping table which correlates a **10-digit identification number** which is **permanently assigned** to each Internet client with the **12-digit IP address and port number** which the Internet client has **most recently registered** with the directory server for receipt of Internet telephony calls (*Liu*, paragraph [0034], lines 2 to 15, emphasis added). The directory server then provides the connection IP address and port number currently utilized by the second Internet client for receipt of call signaling messages to the first Internet client. Utilizing this information the first Internet client is capable of opening the call signaling connection, without requiring the operator to input an IP address associated with the second Internet client.

As it is desirable to provide for initiating a telephone call at an Internet client and terminating the call at a traditional telephone device (*Liu* paragraph [0036] lines1 to 3), a PSTN bridge is provided for relaying audio data between a device on the Internet and a traditional telephone device coupled to the public switched telephone network (PSTN). The PSTN bridge operates as a telephony client in the above discussed manner for communicating audio data representing a telephone conversation with a remote telephony client via the Internet and operates as a PSTN telephone for communicating audio data representing the telephone conversation with a remote telephone device via the PSTN.

Thus *Liu* is directed to a system and method for establishing a voice over IP connection between two parties wherein a permanent ID (a 10-digit phone number) is assigned to each user in the system. The permanent ID is then mapped to a roaming IP address.

US Patent No. 7, 292, 855 to *Kumar et al*

Kumar is directed to an apparatus, and method, for facilitating concurrent packet data communication sessions at a mobile node/device. More specifically *Kumar* is directed to an apparatus and method for the provision of concurrent IP data and Internet Over The Air (IOTA) secessions.

Under the system of *Kumar* the mobile node includes transceiver circuitry (*Kumar* Fig 1, transmitter 42 and receiver 44). The transceiver circuitry operates to send and to receive packet-formatted data pursuant to data communication sessions to permit effectuation of data communication services (see *Kumar* column 7, lines 22 to 23). To create a primary packet data session, the mobile node generates a mobile IP registration request that is sent by the mobile node, to its home agent (*Kumar* column 8, lines 36 to 37). The mobile IP request includes information of the care of address, through which the mobile node can be reached (i.e. current packet data service node servicing the mobile node). A response from the home agent is returned to the mobile node, and a primary packet data communication session ensues (*Kumar* column 8, lines 40 to 42). Once the primary session is established the home agent becomes responsible for forwarding all packet data destined for the mobile node to the care of address. The care of address forwards the data packets delivered thereto to the mobile node (*Kumar* column 6, line 61 to column 7, line 3).

While the primary data communication session is ongoing, a secondary packet data communication session, can be initiated via the mobile nodes second session initiator. In the case of *Kumar*, the second data session is an IOTA reprovisioning session. The mobile node second session initiator generates a mobile EP registration request which is delivered

to the IOTA home agent. The IOTA home agent then generates a reply thereafter IOTA provisioning is performed between the mobile node and the IOTA server (*Kumar* column 8, lines 53 to 60). During the provisioning secession, provisioning indicia is provided to the mobile node, and the mobile node's communicator operates upon and stores the provisioning indicia at the mobile node for subsequent retrieval and usage during subsequent IOTA communication sessions. The provisioning indicia includes, e.g. the IP address of the IOTA server, user identification and password values, etc. (*Kumar* column 8, lines 9 to 17)

When the provisioning is completed, the mobile node generates a mobile IP deregistration request requesting deregistration of the IOTA provisioning session. The request is routed to the IOTA home agent, and the home agent generates a reply that is returned to the mobile node. Subsequently the mobile node later utilizes the provisioning indicia provided thereto when a subsequent data connection is formed. When the deregistration reply is received at the mobile node, the subsequent connection is not requested until the provisioning data connection, i.e., the secondary data connection, becomes inactive (*Kumar* column 8, line 63 to column 9, line 7).

Thus *Kumar* is directed to a system wherein for establishing a secondary data session on a mobile node without the need to interrupt the primary data session or delay another data communication session due to an ongoing provisioning session.

Liu* in view of *Kumar

From the above discussion, it is apparent that the *Liu* and *Kumar* references are silent regarding a number of salient features as presently recited in claim 1. Claim 1 as presently presented recites *inert alia* accessing a web-site via a web browser installed on

the computer, sending a message to a message server from the web-site, capturing at the message server the computer's IP address and port number, assigning a temporary phone number to the computer based on IP address and port number, delivering the message together with the temporary phone number to the mobile telecommunication device whereby a user of the mobile telecommunication device can send a response message to the computer.

Liu fails to disclose a message server which sends a message to a mobile phone. As noted above Liu utilizes a directory server, the directory server of is in no way equivalent to the message server of the instant application. As previously stated, the directory server of *Liu* provides the IP address and port number of the last registered location at which the second Internet client received calls to the first Internet client, based on ID permanently assigned to the second Internet client. The directory server of *Liu* does not assign an identification number to identification information associated with the computer, rather it associates a static telephone number with the IP address at which a particular device was last registered.

Moreover, *Liu* fails to teach or suggest the feature of a message server delivering a message to a mobile telecommunications device. Rather the delivery server of *Liu* receives a request from the first Internet client in response to which it provides the relevant IP address of the last know registered location from which the second Internet client was serviced. Once the first Internet client is provided with this information it the exchanges media setup messages with the second client to establish an audio channel between the two. As previously stated, *Liu* is primarily concerned with the establishment of a voice over IP secession. *Liu* fails to teach or suggest sending a message via a web site to a message

server and then having the message server deliver the message together with an identification number to a mobile telecommunications device as recited in claim 1. *Liu* is wholly silent as to the use of mobile telecommunications device *per se*.

Liu fails to teach or suggest the feature of accessing a web site via a web browser installed on the computer to send a message to a mobile telecommunications device. This function, however, in the Examiner's opinion is taught in the *Kumar* reference and more specifically at column 6, lines 43 to 47 of the reference in question. The referenced passage relates to the use of content sources at which content to be delivered to the mobile node is sourced. The passage does not teach or suggest the accessing a web site via a web browser installed on the computer to send a message to a mobile telecommunications device as recited in claim 1. The referenced passage appears to discuss the use of a client/server architecture to provide content to a mobile node.

As would be appreciated by a person of ordinary skill in the art under a client/server model the server does not access the content which it hosts *per se*, rather the server is responsible by accepting requests from the client (i.e. content request from the browser installed on the client device) and providing responses to the client's requests. The response can include an HTML document, but can also be a raw file, an image, or some other type of document. Thus the server provides response which allows the client browser to access the requested content. Accordingly the *Kumar* reference fails to disclose accessing a accessing a web-site via a web browser installed on the computer. In fact *Kumar* is wholly silent as to the use of a web browser installed on a computer to allow a user to access a website in order to send messages to the mobile device, rather it is the mobile device in the system of *Kumar* that accesses content contained on the servers.

As stated above, *Liu* is directed to a system and method for implementing a voice call over an IP network wherein the calling party locates the called part by a 10-digit identification number (which is permanently assigned to each party within the system). The 10-digit identification number is mapped to a 12-digit IP address and port number which the Internet client has most recently registered with the directory server for receipt of Internet telephony calls. *Kumar* by contrast is directed to a system for establishing a secondary data session on a mobile node without the need to interrupt the primary data session or delay another data communication session due to an ongoing provisioning session. Thus, *Liu* and *Kumar* are directed to entirely different systems.

Applicant therefore submits that it would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art to combine the references in the recited manner as *Liu* and *Kumar* are directed to distinctly different and divergent systems. *Liu* is directed to a voice over IP system, while Kumar is directed to the establishment of multiple concurrent data sessions on a single mobile device. There is nothing in either document that would suggest to a person of ordinary skill that it would be feasible to combine the voice over IP system of *Liu* with the system of *Kumar.* Moreover, even if the references were combined in the recited manner, the resultant combination of the documents fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies. Neither the *Liu* nor *Kumar* reference teach or suggest a message server to deliver a message and temporary phone number to a mobile communications device. Nor do the references relied upon by the Examiner teach or suggest accessing a web-site via a web browser installed on the computer to send a message to a message server.

In light of the above discussion, Applicant therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 13 recites similar limitations to that of claim 1 and as such is considered to be patentable over the combination of *Liu* and *Kumar* for the reasons stated above.

Claims 2-12 and 14 to 23 are also considered to be in condition for allowance in view of their dependency upon allowable independent claims.

Conclusion

In summary Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 6-17 and 19-23 as presented herein, patentably distinguish over the combination of the cited references. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to the claims and requests allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 4, 2009

By: Jennifer J. Taylor
Jennifer J. Taylor, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 48,711